



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

Memorandum

To: Meeting Attendees (see page 4)

From: Scott Shelton - Gresham, Smith & Partners
Jill Brown - Edwards-Pitman, Environmental, Inc.

Meeting Date: August 19, 2008

Subject: CSSFT-0008-00(314), Pickens County, PI No. 0008314
SR 136 Safety Improvement Project

General Information

A meeting was held on August 19, 2008 at the GDOT Office of Environment/Location (OEL) to discuss the cultural resources and public involvement requirements for the SR 136 Safety Improvement Project.

Jody Braswell began the meeting with an introduction to the project. SR 136 within the project area is a designated bike route with the rural shoulders. The crash rates within the project area are almost double the statewide average crash rates for this type of facility. Additionally, from 2000 through 2005 there were 55 accidents that did not involve collisions with another vehicle. The main purpose and need for the project is to improve safety. The concept for the project would involve increasing the shoulder widths to match current standards but would not involve increasing capacity. The majority of the preliminary concept alignment follows the existing alignment except at one curve.

The project is currently scheduled for April 2009 right-of-way and April 2011 let to construction, but this schedule will change. Derrick Cameron needs information about the anticipated project schedule so he can update it in the GDOT system.

Cultural Resources

On June 10, 2008, Lisa Crawford and Garrett Silliman met with the Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS) to discuss cultural resources in the project area based upon the MVHS response to the Section 106 Notification. The purpose of this meeting had been to get information from and to partner with the MVHS. The MVHS advertised the meeting in the *Pickens County Progress*, a local newspaper. Approximately 40 persons were present including 28 members of the MVHS. As a result of the presence of individuals not involved in the historical society, the meeting discussion shifted to project design,

concept, right-of-way, and survey issues. Public attendees raised concerns about private property rights, all GDOT projects, and the purpose for the project being to help developers. The purpose of the meeting was not accomplished.

No archaeological fieldwork has been done. The specialists wanted to meet with GDOT and FHWA to discuss how to proceed before continuing the structural resource survey or beginning the archaeology survey.

The approach preferred by GDOT would be for the archaeology and history surveys to look at a wider area for the alignment. This will give a better picture of what resources are in the project area. This is also beneficial for the preliminary engineering.

There is potential for Native American involvement. Early tribal notification has been sent out.

Public Involvement and Notification

GDOT is trying to get input and to involve local residents, but based upon the June 10, 2008 meeting described above in "Cultural Resources," the public is opposed to the project. There seems to be a misconception that the project would involve widening the roadway to benefit developers. The project would not add capacity, with widening limited to improving shoulders to meet current standards. GDOT will need to investigate where the private developments are prior to the public involvement efforts. Public opposition was also expressed about bicycle lanes. The corridor is a bicycle route, but the rural shoulders address this route designation without requiring separate bicycle lanes.

Some education efforts should be done before a Public Information Open House (PIOH). GDOT needs to talk to the media about what the actual project is. The media should also be informed about the number of fatalities that have occurred. Emmanuella Mythril suggested coordinating with the *Pickens County Progress* for an article rather than just providing a press release.

The press release and article would include a reference to the GDOT website. The website would be updated to provide information about the project and to include a graphic showing where accidents have occurred within the project area.

Katy Allen recommended that a stakeholders group should be formed after the media coordination, prior to a PIOH. GDOT could then meet with the core group, discuss the project Purpose and Need, the survey area, the project concept, mitigation measures, and other projects such as the Old Federal Road or New Echota. Coordination with the stakeholders would also include an explanation of how the project development process works. The stakeholders then could act as liaisons at the PIOH. Without holding the stakeholders meeting before the PIOH, the PIOH may just result in the same outcome as the June 10, 2008 meeting. Eric Duff will provide a list of potential stakeholders that will include the MVHS, the Chamber of Commerce, the local government planning and transportation personnel, the Trail of Tears Association, and a local resident. Katy Allen would like to be involved in the stakeholders meetings.

GDOT District 6 would also need to be involved in the public involvement process because they are often the first point of contact for local residents.

There would likely need to be at least two stakeholders meetings. If the results of the first stakeholders meeting are favorable, then the project should move to a PIOH. If the results of the stakeholders meeting are not favorable, then information from the stakeholders meeting should be incorporated into the project and surveys, and the results taken back to the stakeholders. The stakeholders should be shown the project constraints and how the concerns were addressed.

The PIOH would help address the public concerns. Showing just a corridor at the PIOH was discussed, but the decision was that it would be OK to show a concept as a starting point. Letters should be sent to the land owners notifying them about the PIOH. The property owners within the project corridor were also previously sent notification about the project from the surveyors.

Katy Allen recommended that the PIOH include a presentation to reduce misinformation rather than following the standard informal PIOH format. The presentation should discuss the Purpose and Need for the project and the project concept (that the project would not add capacity). GDOT should consider how to communicate with those who are opposed to the project.

Garrett Silliman suggested inviting the public to comment on what is there. Getting input could be very valuable on this project. Garrett will send a copy of a questionnaire that was used on another project to Eric Duff for review and comment.

A public hearing open house (PHOH) would also be required for this project.

NEPA Documentation

Katy Allen said that the appropriate level of environmental documentation would be an Environmental Assessment to be prepared for possible litigation. The project may also require a full Section 4(f) Evaluation.

Edwards-Pitman will provide Gresham Smith with a scope and cost estimate. These are to include the stakeholders meetings. A full Section 4(f) Evaluation should also be included in the cost estimate and schedule. Archaeology will survey 100 feet beyond the corridor.

Action Items:

Gresham, Smith and Partners

- Provide Purpose and Need information to GDOT for the press release.
- Create graphic showing accident locations on an aerial background.
- Notify property owners before surveys occur.

Edwards-Pitman Environmental

- Prepare a schedule, scope and budget to include a wider archaeology survey area and preparation of an Environmental Assessment with a Section 4(f) Evaluation.

Georgia Department of Transportation

- Prepare a press release.
- Determine if an article should be prepared with the *Pickens County Progress*.
- Identify stakeholders.
- Determine where the private development in the area is located.
- Set up a stakeholders meeting.
- Schedule a PIOH after the stakeholders meeting.
- Review the scope and budget prepared by Gresham, Smith and Partners and Edwards-Pitman to determine responsibilities for the stakeholders meetings.
- Prepare information on other GDOT projects to showcase during public involvement.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name	Office	Phone	Email
Katy Allen	FHWA	404-699-3657	katy.allen@fhwa.dot.gov
Jody Braswell	Gresham Smith	678-518-3655	jody_braswell@gspnet.com
Jill Brown	Edwards-Pitman	770-333-9484	jbrown@edwards-pitman.com
Derrick Cameron	GDOT TO	404-635-8153	dcameron@dot.ga.gov
Jonathan Cox	GDOT OEL	404-699-3475	jocox@dot.ga.gov
Lisa Crawford	Edwards-Pitman	770-333-9484	lcrawford@edwards-pitman.com
Eric Anthony Duff	GDOT OEL	404-699-4406	eduff@dot.ga.gov
Emmanuella Myrthil	GDOT OEL	404-699-6967	emyrthil@dot.ga.gov
Scott Shelton	Gresham Smith	678-518-3684	scott_shelton@gspnet.com
Garrett Silliman	Edwards-Pitman	770-333-9484	gsilliman@edwards-pitman.com



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

January 11, 2010

MEETING NOTES

STAKEHOLDER MEETING WITH MARBLE VALLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY PICKENS COUNTY, GEORGIA GS&P Project No. 26340.09

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2009

PARTICIPANTS: Scott Shelton — Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
Kent Black – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
Jody Braswell – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
Mimi Jo Butler – Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS)
Bob Perdue – Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS)
Gloria Beaudet – Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS)
Linda Geiger – Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS)
Tammy Bell – Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS)
James Hefner – Marble Valley Historical Society (MVHS)
Lisa Crawford – Edwards-Pitman (EP)

DISCUSSION: SR 136 SAFETY PROJECT

1. GS&P began the meeting by highlighting GDOT's primary purpose for all roadways in the state is to provide safety and accessibility for the traveling public. GS&P briefly described the history of the project per the attached agenda.
2. GS&P highlighted the various locations of the crashes along the SR 136 corridor as shown on the aerial map, and GS&P noted that there has been one fatality per year for the last eight years for this corridor. Therefore, GDOT identified SR 136 as a safety project.
3. GS&P stated that a majority of the accidents were not a collision with another motor vehicle. Such accidents are often attributed to potential roadway alignment issues (i.e. horizontal and vertical design issues). In addition, this section of SR 136 has 2.5 times more accidents than other sections of SR 136, and this section of SR 136 has 7 times more accidents than similar types of roadways throughout the state.
4. GS&P was tasked by GDOT to evaluate SR 136 to determine what changes might be made to the horizontal and vertical design to help reduce the number of

Design Services For The Built Environment

2325 Lakeview Parkway, Suite 400 / Alpharetta, Georgia 30009-7940 / Phone 770.754.0755 / www.gspnet.com

G:\2634009\0_Comm\M_Meetings\MM Marble Valley 12 14 09.doc



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 TO SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 11, 2010

Page 2

- crashes on SR 136, and GS&P noted that the roadway will not be widened to four lanes as part of this project.
5. Linda Greiger and James Hefner did not believe the road to be hazardous. However, Gloria Beaudet noted some areas that were hazardous.
 6. MVHS noted that high speeds on SR 136 lead to accidents on the sharp curves. MVHS recommended enforcement and signage to help slow speeders down along SR 136. GS&P noted that signing and striping could be completed to address safety concerns. However, GS&P stated these measures on their own probably will not address the safety concerns along the roadway.
 7. MVHS suggested widening the shoulders at the two sharp horizontal curves on SR 136 to help reduce accidents.
 8. GS&P noted that the proposed project would include upgrading the shoulder to 10' wide with 6'6" paved and 3'6" grass, and the 6'6" paved section would be adequate to accommodate bicycles per the North Georgia Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
 9. MVHS inquired if alcohol was a contributing factor to the accidents. GS&P will investigate further to see if accidents were attributed to alcohol or roadway conditions.
 10. GS&P described that a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) would be formed from stakeholders along the corridor. The purpose of the CAC is to gather information about the corridor and to build consensus for an alternative that improves the safety of SR 136 and preserves cultural and historical resources. The CAC will meet 2-3 times and the first meeting will be held in February 2010.
 11. GS&P highlighted previous misunderstandings including the DRI which gave the perception the GDOT project would widen the roadway. GS&P reminded MVHS the proposed project is for safety issues, not capacity. It was MVHS understanding that the business that applied for the DRI are now in foreclosure.
 12. GS&P noted that historical and cultural resources exist along the SR 136 corridor. To determine potential historical resources, Edwards-Pitman will start with the tax assessor's office. Edwards-Pitman noted the various locations tentatively identified as potential historic resources on the aerial map.
 13. GS&P inquired from MVHS on the location of any known resources along SR 136, and requested any maps or other data be sent to EP.



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 TO SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 11, 2010

Page 3

14. MVHS has old maps showing Cherokee structures and MVHS noted that Mrs. Duckett was knowledgeable about the area. MVHS will coordinate with EP to get them the information.
15. In February 2009, the Federal government identified parts of the Trail of Tears in northwest Georgia, north Alabama and North Carolina as part of the National Registry (WAMP Bill). MVHS stated they will look at more segments of the Old Federal Road/Trail of Tears to be added to the registry in Georgia.
16. MVHS believes the National Park is considering a park for the Trail of Tears possibly along SR 136. Eric Marz or Mahr is the representative for the National Parks and MVHS discussed this 4 years ago with him.
17. MVHS stated that parts of Old Federal Road are located on private property and you can see sections of the Old Federal Road bed as you drive along SR 136.
18. MVHS believes that many of the houses and pasture around the Blaine Masonic lodge are potential resources. MVHS has requested a state archaeologist meet on site near the Blaine Masonic Lodge and to date has not met on site.
19. MVHS recommended Section 2 of previous study as a good resource to start with. Edwards-Pitman will verify if they have Section 2 of the previous study and contact MVHS if not.
20. MVHS noted the property owner of the cemetery would like to rezone property for redevelopment, but the property owner is concerned the significance of the cemetery might prevent redevelopment. MVHS noted Marie Hyde is the daughter of Bonnie Hyde, the cemetery and property owner.
21. MVHS stated that many of the artifacts go back to Woodland, MS and are older than the Cherokee Indians.
22. MVHS stated that Saunders Village Town was the former name of the village along SR 136.
23. MVHS noted that the Carmel Historical sign points in the wrong direction and requests GS&P work coordinate with GDOT to correct. MVHS submitted a picture of the sign and GS&P forwarded to GDOT on 12/16/09.
24. MVHS stated that any dirt moved along SR 136 would probably be an archeological site since it is part of the Old Federal Road.



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 TO SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 11, 2010

Page 4

25. GS&P's goal is to balance safety improvements to the roadway while preserving the cultural and historical resources.
26. MVHS agrees safety is important for SR 136 corridor. MVHS desire is to maintain the integrity of Federal Road wherever possible. If the Federal Road has to be impacted, MVHS would request research and documentation be completed to capture and memorialize the Federal Road/Trail of Tears route.
27. GS&P shared how a CAC would be formed for the safety project on SR 136 for stakeholders along the corridor. The purpose of the CAC would be to gain information about the corridor and to develop consensus for a preferred alternative that improves the safety of SR 136 while preserving the natural and historical resources.
28. MVHS stated there was a farm close to SR 515 and suggested GS&P might want to include the landowner on the CAC. His property comes up to SR 136 project on the outside of the curve.
29. MVHS suggested some other potential contacts to be included as Dr. Robert Keller with the Mountain Conservation Trust and Don Wells with Mountain Stewards. MVHS will check with Don. MVHS recommended checking their respective websites for additional information.
30. GS&P will follow up with MVHS to determine who their two representatives will be for the CAC in January 2010.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at this meeting. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained herein, please contact me.

Prepared by: Scott Shelton, P. E.
Project Engineer



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

January 8, 2010

MEETING NOTES

SR 136 STAKEHOLDER MEETING WITH NORTHWEST GEORGIA REGIONAL COMMISSION PICKENS COUNTY, GEORGIA GS&P Project No. 26340.09

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2009

PARTICIPANTS: Scott Shelton — Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
 Kent Black – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
 Jody Braswell – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
 Jill Brown – Edwards-Pitman Environmental (EP)
 Lisa Crawford – Edwards-Pitman Environmental (EP)
 Kevin McAuliff – Northwest Georgia Regional Commission (NWGRC)
 David Howerin – Northwest Georgia Regional Commission (NWGRC)

DISCUSSION: SR 136 SAFETY PROJECT

1. In regard to animosity about the project in 2007, NWGRC noted that the local residents were aware of a developer's plan in close proximity to SR 136 and the residents assumed the road improvements were for the developer, and would involve widening SR 136. The residents were angry since widening of SR 136 would impact the cultural and historical resources. GS&P will investigate further to determine if the development is still moving forward or not.
2. GS&P stated the purpose of the project is to address safety concerns due to the high number of accidents along the SR 136 corridor.
3. GS&P stated the history of the project per the attached agenda and noted that based on FHWA guidance in 2008, additional coordination was needed with stakeholders along SR 136.
4. GS&P presented the fact sheet and noted that half of all the crashes on SR 136 are either injury or fatal crashes, and most of the crashes are happening off the road which can be attributed to the horizontal and vertical design of the road. Also, inadequate vertical design might be the cause of accidents along the straight sections of roadway on SR 136.

Design Services For The Built Environment

2325 Lakeview Parkway, Suite 400 / Alpharetta, Georgia 30009-7940 / Phone 770.754.0755 / www.gspnet.com

G:\2634009\0_Comm\MM_Meetings\MM_NWGRC_12 14 09.doc



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 AT SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 8, 2010

Page 2

5. GS&P noted that the injury and fatal crash rate is higher than the statewide average and is higher than similar roadway facilities in close proximity to SR 136.
6. GS&P has been tasked by GDOT to form a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) for the project to gather information about SR 136 and build consensus for an alternative that will improve safety and preserve the cultural and historical resources.
7. NWGRC stated that the alleged cemetery on SR 136 originally had no organizational grave stones, but now the cemetery has organized head stones. In addition, some people believe their ancestors are buried in the cemetery and they hold ceremonies at the cemetery to honor their ancestors with out permission from the property owner.
8. To support the cemetery exists; a local dowser was hired and investigated the site. The dowser claims to have located the old fort site and identified the people buried at the cemetery. Reverend Walker has documented many of the cultural and historical resources, but NWGRC does not believe the data to be accurate and would not recommend coordinating with him.
9. To protect the property and prevent trespassing, the property owner built a fence around the cemetery. The property owner is concerned the cemetery could be labeled a cultural/historical resource and prevents the property from being redeveloped. NWGRC recommended GS&P meet with the property owner about the SR 136 safety project.
10. NWGRC is certain the Fort was an Indian removal site, but does not believe there are any Indians buried at the cemetery since the Fort was in existence for a short time. EP also does not believe the cemetery is culturally significant. The location of the Fort is unknown. Also, the Cherokee Indians do not recognize the cemetery as part of their ancestry.
11. NWGRC noted that the Trail of Tears follows the Old Federal Road and part of the Old Federal Road is underneath existing SR 136. Traces of Old Federal Road are on both sides of SR 136
12. GS&P stated that to facilitate public involvement a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) would be formed from stakeholders in the area and would meet 2-3 times to gather information and build consensus for an alternative to address safety issues and preserve cultural and historical resources.



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 AT SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 8, 2010

Page 3

13. NWGRC recommended Kevin McAuliff represent them on the CAC and asked that David Howerin be updated on stakeholder and CAC meetings.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at this meeting. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained herein, please contact me.

Prepared by: Scott Shelton, P.E.
Project Manager

rjc



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

January 8, 2010

MEETING NOTES

**GDOT STAKEHOLDER MEETING WITH GEORGIA CHAPTER OF TRAIL OF TEARS
ASSOCIATION
PICKENS COUNTY, GEORGIA
GS&P Project No. 26340.09**

MEETING DATE: December 16, 2009

PARTICIPANTS: Scott Shelton — Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
 Kent Black – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
 Jody Braswell – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
 Jill Brown – Edwards-Pitman Environmental (EP)
 Garrett Silliman – Edwards-Pitman Environmental (EP)
 Linda Geiger – GA Trail of Tears Association (TOTA)
 Jeff Bishop – GA Trail of Tears Association (TOTA)

DISCUSSION: SR 136 SAFETY PROJECT

1. GS&P highlighted the history of the project
 - a. 2002 – GDOT District Six identified need for safety project
 - b. 2005 – Consultant recommends operation and safety improvements as part of county wide plan
 - c. 2007 – GS&P is hired by GDOT to complete safety project along SR 136 and Edwards-Pitman begins environmental study
 - d. 2008 – FHWA directs GDOT to coordinate with stakeholders and form Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).
 - e. 2009 – GDOT coordinates with GS&P to coordinate with stakeholders and form CAC.
2. GS&P noted the numerous fatalities and accidents along SR 136 as shown on the aerial display that prompted GDOT to create a safety project for the corridor.
3. Based on the fact that the alignment of the roadway has not changed since the 1890's, TOTA noted it was self evident why so many accidents had occurred.
4. TOTA concerned about preserving Trail of Tears / Old Federal Road since it helps tell the story of the Trail of Tears to the public.

Design Services For The Built Environment

2325 Lakeview Parkway, Suite 400 / Alpharetta, Georgia 30009-7940 / Phone 770.754.0755

G:\2634009\0_Comm\M_Meetings\MM_GA TOTA_12 16 09.doc



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 AT SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 8, 2010

Page 2

5. TOTA requested GDOT preserve the Federal Road-Trail of Tears route along SR 136 as much as possible, but the TOTA recognized that some impacts to the Federal Road-Trail of Tears route might be necessary to improve the safety of SR 136. TOTA would prefer view sheds be created along SR 136 to view the Federal Road-Trail of Tears route. TOTA requested the Mission site be preserved and a view shed developed. The TOTA also requested a view shed for the Fort Newnan site be provided though not as a high priority as the Mission site.
6. GS&P requested TOTA bring data and maps to first CAC meeting to help GS&P and GDOT identify potential view sheds that need to be preserved.
7. TOTA has coordinated with GDOT on other projects, and TOTA sees GDOT as a partner in preserving the Trail of Tears.
8. TOTA is working with the National Park Service to establish a national park. The purpose of the park would be to mark the trail and maintain as many view sheds of the trail as possible. TOTA has not heard if a park has been discussed or considered for the Trail of Tears in Pickens County. TOTA recommends coordinating with Steve Barnes at National Park Service in Arizona.
9. TOTA is developing plan to sign the Trail of Tears along SR 136 and is coordinating with FHWA for an approved sign. TOTA will provide any signage concepts to GS&P to consider placement as part of the safety project.
10. TOTA will email all information they have on the Federal Road-Trail of Tears locations to Edwards-Pitman and Gresham, Smith and Partners.
11. GS&P emphasized that the proposed project's purpose is to address safety concerns. Any proposed improvements would still utilize a two lane roadway section with corrections to the horizontal and vertical curves along SR 136.
12. GS&P anticipates and will strive to ensure the proposed safety improvements on SR 136 can be balanced with the preservation of the cultural and the historical resources along SR 136.
13. GS&P noted that currently early stakeholder coordination is underway. To date, GS&P has met with NWGRC, Marble Valley Historical Society and the City of Talking Rock and Pickens County in addition to TOTA.
14. GS&P stated that to facilitate public involvement a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) would be formed from stakeholders in the area and would meet 2-3 times



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 AT SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 8, 2010

Page 3

to gather information and build consensus for an alternative to address safety issues and preserve cultural and historical resources. The CAC would meet 2-3 times to gather information about the corridor and build consensus.

15. TOTA recommended Linda Grieger be the CAC representative and Jeff Bishop be a part of any communications.
16. In regard to the cemetery on SR 136, the TOTA noted that no records have been found of Cherokee burials at Fort Newnan. TOTA doubtful any Cherokee burials occurred since Fort was in place for only 2 to 3 weeks. TOTA stated potential for more Cherokee Indian settlements along Old Hwy. 5.
17. In January 2010, EP will begin Phase 1 Archeology resource survey and will look for specific archeological findings by performing shovel tests along the corridor. EP will use ground penetrating radar and metal detection at various shovel testing sites to further identify archeological resources in the field.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at this meeting. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained herein, please contact me.

Prepared by: Scott Shelton, P.E.
Project Engineer

rjc



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

SR 136 Safety Project Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #1

March 16, 2010

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314
CSSFT-0008-00(314)
GS&P Project No. 26340.09

MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 24, 2010
MEETING TIME: 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM
MEETING LOCATION: PICKENS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

PARTICIPANTS: Community Work Group
Mimi Jo Butler, Marble Valley Historical Society
Tammy Bell, Marble Valley Historical Society
Linda Geiger, GA Chapter Trail of Tears
Honorable Rodney Gibson, Blaine Masonic Lodge
Buddy Callahan, Business Owner
Wendell Aenchbacher, Property Owner
Edsel Dean, Property Owner

Staff Work Group
Chetna Dixon, FHWA – Georgia Division
Joey Low, Pickens County Land Development
Kevin McAuliff, Northwest Georgia Regional
Norman Pope, Pickens County
Greg Callus, Pickens County Public Works Director
Commissioner Robert Jones, Pickens County

Project Team
Kent Black, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Jody Braswell, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Scott Shelton, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Ronda Coyle, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Derrick Cameron, GDOT Traffic Operations (PM)
Michael Nash, GDOT Traffic Operations
Wes King, GDOT District Six
Jill Brown, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
Lisa Crawford, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
Garrett Silliman, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
David Adair, Edwards-Pitman Environmental

DISCUSSION: CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) #1

A. Introductions

Kent Black opened the meeting and asked the meeting participants to introduce themselves. Kent then briefly reviewed the meeting agenda, the CAC notebook, and the expectations for the committee.

B. Organization and Purpose

Kent Black provided a general overview of the project team. Kent discussed the roles and responsibilities document contained in the CAC members' notebooks and noted the role of the CAC committee was to gather and share information on critical issues, assist in development of alternatives, and support the project team. Kent shared the commitment and pledge for the CAC: build consensus, respect and constructive input. Kent asked the CAC members to review the commitment and pledge provided in each notebook and requested the CAC sign the document.

C. Project Development

The project development process includes a historical and roadway story. These stories, plus crash data, traffic data, geometrics and environmental data will assist the CAC to develop a recommendation for the corridor.

D. Environmental Resources

Jill Brown with Edwards-Pitman Environmental (EP) explained how the project will be reviewed for environmental impacts. EP will review the social environment (schools, churches) and the physical environment (air quality, noise). EP is in the process of identifying the potential archeological footprint for the project. SR 136 is believed to be part of the Old Federal Road and the route of the Trail of Tears. Fort Newnan, built as part of the removal of the Cherokee Indians, may be within the project footprint, but may not be part of the impacted area. The cemetery identified on SR 136 is not included in the project footprint and therefore is not being studied. There are several historic homes in the area as well as the Masonic Lodge. However, SHPO has not approved any of the historic resources. To date, no endangered species or protected aquatic species have been identified.

E. Roadway History

In 2002, GDOT recommended a safety improvement project for the corridor and in 2005 a Pickens County study recommended improvements to SR 136. In 2007, GDOT hired GS&P and Edwards-Pitman to begin preliminary evaluations of the corridor. In 2008 the Federal Highway Administration directed GDOT to coordinate with the stake holders on the corridor and develop a Citizens' Advisory Committee.

GDOT's primary goal is the safety of motorists. On SR 136, several safety deficiencies have been identified by GDOT and Pickens County. Contrary to previous perception, only safety improvements are proposed on SR 136 and not widening per a new residential development.

Kent Black highlighted that 46% of all crashes on SR 136 were either injury or fatal and not a collision with another vehicle. Kent Black stated that this corridor has 3.5 times more fatal crashes than the statewide average for similar type roadways and has a crash rate 2.5 times higher than sections just west of the proposed project. During a meeting with Pickens County, the Fire Chief confirmed SR 136 had many crashes over the last eight years. Traffic studies, along SR 136, show traffic volume doubling in the next 20 years potentially meaning more crashes. It was noted that motorists' speed was not a major factor for accidents.

F. Roadway Geometrics

Jody Braswell identified three (3) horizontal curves on the corridor (General Store, Antioch Church Road and Old Ellijay/Hwy. 5 Road) that do not meet current standards. Jody also highlighted four (4) vertical curves with erroneous sight distance on SR 136: SR 136 connector east of SR 136, Antioch Church Road, and two on Priest Circle that need to be improved. Lack of shoulders on SR 136 prevents motorists from correcting over steer movements in horizontal curves. Kent Black interjected that some of the fatalities along SR 136 could be attributed to the vertical curves.

G. Facilitated Discussion

Kent Black stated he would like the CAC members to utilize the black and white aerial layout of the corridor to identify additional accidents and concerns not shown.

Buddy Callahan noted that a fatality (Ms. Moon) was not captured on the layout in front of his business.

Joey Low noted he was surprised about the accidents in the middle of the corridor and thought more accidents occurred at the end of SR 136 at Hwy. 515.

Wendell Aenchbacher noted there had been three fatalities in front of his property (Corey Dean, Ms. Mulkey, Bartow County man) and theorized that the fatalities occurred due to speed or driver unfamiliarity with the area. Mr. Aenchbacher noted the supply trucks are very familiar with the area and know when to slow their vehicles down.

Kent Black stated GS&P investigated accidents over the last ten (10) years, but would research the additional names given to make sure all accidents are recorded.

Buddy Callahan surmised that all the crashes in front of his business were due to driver error except for Ms. Mulkey.

Kent Black stated that the accidents shown were the end point of the accident. The accident may have begun in one area but ended several hundred feet away.

Linda Geiger inquired if any of the crashes were speed or alcohol related. Based on the accident reports, neither alcohol nor high rates of speed were major indicators for the crashes. The major contributors of accidents were over corrections, flipping of vehicle, losing control, and hitting an object (tree, etc.).

Joey Low inquired if any of the accidents might be attributed to local or regional motorists. Kent Black noted GS&P was unsure and would research further. Kent Black stated that regional motorists would certainly have different familiarity with SR 136 than local residents.

The CAC noted that police enforcement is not adequate enough to slow motorists and speed often contributed to accidents along the corridor.

The CAC believes there is a lack of signage along SR 136 and signage needs to be a higher quality and more prominent. The CAC noted that regional motorists traveling to Carters Lake often find themselves in Talking Rock due to the inadequacy of the signage exiting SR 515.

The CAC inquired if GS&P would be discussing any alignment options today. Kent Black stated alignments would be discussed at the May CAC meeting and committee members will have the opportunity to give input on the potential alternatives.

The CAC expressed concern that parts of the original Federal Road are still visible and did not want those areas destroyed by the project. EP is in the process of identifying the Federal Road remnants that would need to be maintained and protected.

The CAC inquired if assistance was needed in locating archeological resources. To identify the archeological resources, EP had to sign a liability release form with GDOT and GDOT would require the same documentation for other individuals to identify archeological resources. EP recommended not adding additional staff to identify the archeological resources.

The CAC noted that they believe the cemetery extends beyond the fenced area. EP noted that the project may not come in contact with the cemetery, but the outlying area might be mentioned in the environmental findings.

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314

CSSFT-0008-00(314)

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

March 16, 2010

Page 5

However, the cemetery will not be researched since it is not in GDOT's scope.

The committee stated that a study had been completed at Talking Rock Creek (west of SR 515) and identified endangered mussels in the area. EP will be completing aquatic surveys in the spring and summer to determine if endangered species exist along the corridor. The committee noted there was a water study completed recently or soon to be completed by Brown and Caldwell and EP may want to contact them to include their findings. Jill inquired if the study completed was in regards to water quality or species. The committee responded that the study was for both.

A CAC participant noted two potentially historical residences, but the committee was unsure of their age.

H. Project Process/Criteria

GS&P has held several stakeholder meetings prior to the CAC meeting to better understand and identify resources along the corridor and explain the project. At the 2nd CAC meeting in May, alternatives will be discussed. At the 3rd CAC meeting a preferred alternative will be presented and if selected by GDOT, the preferred alternative will be shown at the Public Information Open House (PIOH). The PIOH will be for the general public to review the preferred alternative and provide comments. As CAC members, GDOT would request the CAC be ambassadors to describe the CAC process and the project to the public. After approval of the environmental document, a Public Hearing Open House (PHOH) will be held similar to the PIOH.

I. Project Objectives

The project's primary objective for the corridor is to reduce the number of crashes by improving the horizontal curves, vertical curves, sight distance, shoulders and intersection configurations along SR 136. Any roadway improvements would follow the American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines for road design. Per AASHTO the minimum radius for a horizontal curve is 1,060 feet and the minimum vertical sight distance is 500 feet. Currently, the horizontal radii along SR 136 are: 967 feet at SR 136 connector, 954 feet at Antioch Church Road and 578 feet at Elijah Road. Vertical curves would need to be flattened as the driver's height and distance on the curves does not meet AASHTO standards.

J. Environmental Requirements

For this project, EP would be bound by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act. Additional findings along the project might require the following to be obeyed:

- Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act
- Environmental Justice

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314

CSSFT-0008-00(314)

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

March 16, 2010

Page 6

- Abandoned Cemeteries and Burial Grounds
- Farmland Protection Act
- Endangered Species Act
- Clean Water Act
- Others

K. Tentative Schedule

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| • CAC #2 | May 26, 2010 |
| • CAC #3 | Fall 2010 |
| • PIOH | Winter 2010 |
| • PHOH | Fall 2011 |
| • Environmental Approval | Winter 2011 |
| • Construction | 2014 |

The project schedule length allows adequate time to evaluate the environment and to ensure the environment is protected prior to construction.

L. Closing

GS&P requested the CAC members review the information in their notebooks and to contact GS&P, EP or GDOT with any questions or concerns. In addition, a CAC member contact list is provided so that members may coordinate amongst themselves. For the next CAC meeting, the project team will review the information from today and begin developing alternatives to present to the CAC for review and comment.

The committee inquired if there was funding available for the project and GDOT replied that safety money had been allocated for the project.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at CAC Meeting #1 on February 24, 2010. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained here, please contact Scott Shelton.

Prepared by: Ronda J. Coyle

RJC



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

SR 136 Safety Project Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #2

June 10, 2010

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314
CSSFT-0008-00(314)
GS&P Project No. 26340.09

MEETING DATE: MAY 26, 2010
MEETING TIME: 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM
MEETING LOCATION: PICKENS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

PARTICIPANTS: Community Work Group
Mimi Jo Butler, Marble Valley Historical Society
Tammy Bell, Marble Valley Historical Society
Linda Geiger, GA Chapter Trail of Tears
Honorable Rodney Gibson, Blaine Masonic Lodge
Buddy Callahan, Business Owner
Edsel Dean, Property Owner

Staff Work Group
Chetna Dixon, FHWA – Georgia Division
Kelly Whitson, FHWA – Georgia Division
Joey Low, Pickens County Land Development
Kevin McAuliff, Northwest Georgia Regional
Norman Pope, Pickens County
Larry Coleman, Pickens County Water
Commissioner Robert Jones, Pickens County

Project Team
Kent Black, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Jody Braswell, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Scott Shelton, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Ronda Coyle, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Derrick Cameron, GDOT Traffic Operations (PM)
Michael Nash, GDOT Traffic Operations
Wes King, GDOT District Six
Jill Brown, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
Lisa Crawford, Edwards-Pitman Environmental

DISCUSSION: CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) #2

A. Introductions

Kent Black opened the meeting and asked the meeting participants to introduce themselves. Kent then briefly summarized the meeting agenda and advised the committee that they would be receiving alternatives to review and score as part of the CAC process.

Kent Black recapped the action items that had been identified from the first CAC meeting which included the technical work needed to develop preliminary alternatives for presentation today at CAC #2. Kent commented that additional technical work would be completed after CAC #2 based upon the comments and suggestions of the CAC. A preferred alternative for each critical area will be combined into a proposed conceptual improvement for the entire length of the corridor to present to the general public at a Public Information Open House (PIOH). The PIOH display will be shown to the CAC in the fall prior to the PIOH.

B. Comments from CAC #1

Kent Black shared with the committee the critical comments made by the committee members during CAC #1. These comments included high rates of speed along the corridor, motorist confusion or unfamiliarity with the corridor, potentially endangered species and historical resources. Per comments from CAC #1, GS&P re-verified and refined the locations of all the fatal crashes on the corridor and plotted the beginning and ending points of each crash. Kent noted these crashes were primarily mapped out along the horizontal curve areas.

C. Environmental Resources

Since the last meeting, Edwards-Pitman's (EP) historian and archeologist visited the corridor with CAC members to capture the historical and cultural significance of the area. Fort Newnan and the Caramel Mission were not contained in the study area so they were not evaluated for historical significance. The Kelly House has now been included as part of the Blaine Community and the boundary at the Blaine House has been reduced. Segments of the Old Federal Road highlighted in blue on the display board were identified and will be protected or mitigated if impacted.

EP's next phase of work will include identifying the natural areas and protected species in the area. This process can only be done once the preferred alignment is determined. EP will work with GDOT and GS&P to fine tune the preferred alignment to minimize impacts.

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314

CSSFT-0008-00(314)

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

June 10, 2010

Page 3

EP will also evaluate the noise and air pollution for the preferred alignment. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has not concurred with EP's findings to date.

D. Alternatives Development

Five (5) critical areas were identified along the corridor. These areas include SR 136 Connector, Antioch Church Road, Priest Circle, the sharp horizontal curve, Ellijay Road and SR 515 Access Road. The alternatives were designed per the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design criteria. The alternatives improve safety and operations while minimizing potential impacts to historical and environmental resources. The design team evaluated each alternative for impacts or improvements to the environment, corridor preservation, design, safety and cost and presented their findings graphically on each alternative. Each alternative provided to the CAC members contained a table of the key design, cost, environmental and corridor preservation information needed to evaluate the alternative.

Base improvements were presented that would be appropriate to use with any of the alternatives such as advance warning signs, center line and shoulder rumble strips, shoulder widening, and curve delineation. Kent advised that on their own, these base improvements would not be sufficient enough to reduce crashes, but included with a preferred alternative, should enhance the safety aspect of the corridor.

Commissioner Rob Jones inquired if the raised pavement markers would be removed from the road. GDOT stated that the center line raised pavement markers would be re-installed after construction.

Kent instructed the CAC to review and consider each alternative for the five (5) critical areas appropriately and rank each alternative and/or provide an additional alternative, and provide feedback for each alternative.

E. Open Discussion

Buddy Callahan asked Kent if the preferred alternative had been decided. Kent assured Buddy and the other CAC members that neither GS&P nor GDOT had made any decisions on the preferred alignment for the corridor. Kent stressed that a number of data points have to be evaluated and considered in order for the engineers to make a recommendation to GDOT. Data points include consensus of the property owners, property access, and historical preservation.

Buddy Callahan commented that roundabouts cause too much confusion for people trying to access his property and departing his property and he is concerned that people will not stop at his store if a roundabout is built. Kent

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314

CSSFT-0008-00(314)

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

June 10, 2010

Page 4

assured Buddy that if a roundabout has any merit in this corridor; GS&P will work with Buddy to maintain property access.

GS&P has designed and GDOT has built numerous roundabouts throughout Georgia and each time GDOT coordinated with businesses to maintain access after completion of the roundabout.

A CAC member expressed concern that a roundabout would put Buddy out of business. Kent Black reiterated that the intent of a roundabout is to address safety and traffic concerns and not put anyone out of business. Kent advised the CAC that GS&P would provide members with a traffic simulation of some roundabouts including a roundabout located in the rural area of Douglas County. The roundabout traffic simulation would assist the CAC in understanding the operation and how to navigate through a roundabout. Kent reiterated GS&P and GDOT were not in Pickens County to sell roundabouts.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at CAC Meeting #2 on May 26, 2010. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained here, please contact Scott Shelton.

Prepared by: Ronda J. Coyle

RJC



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

SR 136 Safety Project Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #3

September 15, 2010

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314
CSSFT-0008-00(314)
GS&P Project No. 26340.09

MEETING DATE: September 2, 2010

TIME: 10:30 am – 12:00 pm

PARTICIPANTS: Community Work Group
Mimi Jo Butler, Marble Valley Historical Society
Tammy Bell, Marble Valley Historical Society
Linda Geiger, GA Chapter Trail of Tears
Buddy Callahan, Business Owner
Edsel Dean, Property Owner
Wendell Aenchbacher, Property Owner

Staff Work Group
Joey Low, Pickens County Land Development
Kevin McAuliff, Northwest Georgia Regional
Norman Pope, Pickens County

Project Team
Derrick Cameron, GDOT Traffic Operations (PM)
Michael Nash, GDOT Traffic Operations
Michael Hester, GDOT
Wes King, GDOT District Six
Greg Hood, GDOT District Six
Kent Black, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Jody Braswell, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Scott Shelton, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Ronda Coyle, Gresham, Smith and Partners
Jill Brown, Edwards-Pitman Environmental
Lisa Crawford, Edwards-Pitman Environmental

DISCUSSION: CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #3

A. Introductions

Kent Black opened the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting and asked the participants to introduce themselves. Kent noted the Public Information Open House (PIOH) would be held later this fall and noted the display board on display would be at the PIOH. Kent also stated each CAC member had an 11 x 17 copy of the display in their packet of information today for their use. Kent stated GS&P and GDOT were excited to present to the CAC a preferred alternative and hoped the CAC would find the alternative addressed the improvements to safety while preserving the corridor's historic and cultural stories.

B. Recap of CAC Meetings

Kent Black summarized the CAC process to date:

1. CAC #1 – February 25, 2010 – Identified historical and roadway stories, identified environmental resources, and discussed crashes and concerns
2. CAC #2 – May 26, 2010 – Identified the five critical areas on the corridor, CAC evaluated and ranked alternatives within the five critical areas and provided feedback

C. Scoring Results

1. Kent Black stated part of GS&P's objectives when designing the alternative was to reduce the number and severity of crashes, address the horizontal and vertical curves, repair the sight distance issues and shoulder deficiencies and reconfigure a substandard intersection.
2. In Area 1, Buddy Callahan suggested an alternative to those presented by GS&P. Mr. Callahan's alternative ranked #1 with the CAC, so GS&P carried forward Buddy's suggestion. GS&P completed a technical evaluation of Mr. Callahan's suggestion to compare to the others.
3. In Area 2, the CAC chose the inside realignment as opposed to the outside realignment as the inside realignment would not affect the Old Federal Road.
4. In Area 3, the CAC chose the 90 degree intersection over a 70 degree intersection and 90 degree intersection with a cul-de-sac. The chosen alternative would alleviate the sight distance issues at Priest Circle and provide for a conventional intersection.
5. In Area 4, the CAC chose the inside realignment over a new alignment with a roundabout. Upon technical evaluation, it was discovered an inside realignment had several fatal flaws, so GS&P merged Area 4 and 5 to create an alignment with a roundabout at the end of the corridor to correspond to the CAC's selection of a roundabout.

D. Technical Evaluation

1. Jody Braswell explained for Area 1 both Mr. Callahan's suggestion and the roundabout improved safety on the corridor, although the technical evaluation showed the roundabout would increase safety and lower speed level and both alternatives would provide access to Mr. Callahan's store. Jody Braswell noted Mr. Callahan's suggestion also impacted historical resources as well as adjacent properties. The roundabout had no impacts to either properties or historical resources. Buddy Callahan stated numerous people in the community had voiced a concern over a roundabout and potential number of crashes. Mr. Callahan noted several crashes had been witnessed at a roundabout on Cove Road due to people traveling in the wrong direction on the roundabout. Edsel Dean noted that good signage would control this. Kent Black stated educational material would be distributed to Pickens County at the PIOH on how to maneuver in a roundabout. Jody Braswell noted crashes are possible in a roundabout, but fatal crashes should be reduced since all movements are much slower in a roundabout. Derrick Cameron stated there would be signage as well as additional lighting in the proposed roundabout. Derrick Cameron noted that splitting traffic is not viable in this area and does not provide the safety needed per Mr. Callahan's suggestion.
2. Jody Braswell noted CAC members ranked #1 an inside realignment in Area 4. Upon further technical evaluation an inside realignment would be too costly and the curve would remain sharp. Jody Braswell stated another solution would be to straighten the curve and re-align to Old Hwy. 5, thus combining Areas 4 and 5. Jody Braswell noted by realigning the entire movement to Hwy. 515 it would create a continuous movement and reduces the conflicts to Hwy. 515. Plus, the roundabout built mid-stream would slow down traffic. Jody Braswell stated both Area 4 and 5 alternates improved safety, but a new alignment with a roundabout improved safety significantly while enhancing the corridor and preserving historic resources.
3. Mimi Jo Butler inquired if there would be a stop sign at Hwy. 5 going north coming from Talking Rock and if this would become a potentially hazardous area with the other solutions. Kent Black stated traffic volumes at this location are low and GS&P does not believe it to pose a threat to safety. Mimi Jo Butler stated those that utilize the corridor traveling to Ellijay stay on Hwy. 5 and not Hwy. 515. Kent Black noted there would be static signage in the area and perhaps some dynamic signage during construction to direct travelers on how to proceed.

E. Environmental Update

Jill Brown with Edwards-Pitman Environmental (EP) stated information regarding the historical and environmental resources on the corridor has been provided to SHPO. SHPO requested an investigation of the cemetery to be completed by GDOT to verify if it is a cemetery or not. The Priest Farm on Priest Circle has been identified as a potential historic resource. However, it is not impacted by the project design. EP is not anticipating any problems with SHPO approval of the proposed alternative.

F. CAC Commitment and Pledge

Kent Black reminded the CAC about their agreement to commit to build consensus among the members and assist with public coordination at the PIOH. Kent Black stated the CAC for Pickens County was a pleasure to work with and was a model of the CAC process. Kent Black thanked the members of the CAC and encouraged the members to attend the PIOH and promote the CAC process and share with the public how that GS&P and GDOT worked with the CAC and others to build consensus on an alternative.

G. Open Discussion

1. Kent Black was asked what would be the format of the PIOH. Kent Black replied the PIOH is an open house style for approximately two (2) hours with handouts, display boards and sample CAC notebooks.
2. Kent Black was asked how the PIOH would be advertised to the community. Kent Black replied notification would occur by signage on SR 136, legal ads in the local newspaper, CAC member and flyers.
3. Kent Black was asked if the community had to give their comments regarding the project during the PIOH only. Kent Black replied the community would be able to provide feedback with comment cards or they could parlay their comments to a court reporter at the open house. The public also has the option to take the comment card with them and send it in within 10 days of the PIOH or provide comments online through the GDOT website.
4. District 6 stated preference for not altering the state route as currently shown. GS&P will review the layout and revise areas to keep the state route as the through movement.
5. District 6 inquired if the project at Antioch Church Road was still active and GDOT confirmed it was active at the current time.
6. Mimi Jo Butler advised that while the roundabout simulation was very helpful, more people in the community would benefit from a video of an actual roundabout in the area. Mimi Jo Butler noted it would dispel the old wives tales of dangerous roundabouts. Buddy Callahan noted the roundabouts would cause confusion in the beginning and signage would be very important. The CAC recommended GS&P and GDOT video tape the roundabout at Steve Tate Hwy. and Cove Road.
7. Kent Black was asked if a location for the PIOH had been determined. GDOT stated the process of identifying a location for the PIOH had

MEETING NOTES

P.I. NO.: 0008314

CSSFT-0008-00(314)

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

September 15, 2010

Page 5

not begun and knows the area is limited in meeting space. The CAC suggested holding the PIOH at the technical college or the chamber of commerce.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at CAC Meeting #3 on September 2, 2010. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained here, please contact Scott Shelton.

Prepared by: Ronda J. Coyle

RJC

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: P. I. No. 0008314 OFFICE: Environmental Services
DATE: November 10, 2010

FROM Glenn Bowman, P.E., State Environmental Administrator

TO Distribution Below

SUBJECT PUBLIC INFORMATION OPEN HOUSE SYNOPSIS

PROJECT No. & COUNTY: CSSFT-0008-00(314), Pickens

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed improvements to SR 136 from the SR 136 Connector to SR 515

DATE: November 9, 2010

NUMBER IN ATTENDANCE: 42

FOR: 9

CONDITIONAL: 3

UNCOMMITTED: 1

AGAINST: 2

OFFICIALS IN ATTENDANCE: Robert Jones, Pickens County Commissioner; Norman Pope, Pickens County

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Verbal concerns expressed to GDOT representatives were that the project should be completed quickly, that roundabouts are difficult to learn, that roundabouts would help slow down truck traffic, that measures to protect the historic resources are appreciated, that property owner names need to be updated on the displays, that property owners would like to change their existing driveway access points, that the median dividers in the roundabout approaches should be shortened, that noise needs to be studied for the roundabouts and rumble strips, and that the curve on SR 136 to the west of the project corridor also needs to be fixed. Written comments included that the project should be completed quickly, that noise needs to be studied, that something needs to be done to slow down traffic, that other projects are needed, that property owner names need to be corrected, that the roadway needs to accommodate large trucks, that roundabouts are difficult, that a turn lane is needed at Antioch Church Road, and that the project is too expensive.

PREPARED BY: Jill Brown, Edwards-Pitman for Alexis John, GDOT

TELEPHONE No.: Jill Brown, (770) 333-9484; Alexis John (404) 631-1407

cc: Gerald M. Ross, P.E.
Ben Buchan, P.E.
Kent Sager
Derrick D. Cameron
Kathy Zahul, P.E.
David Moore
Mohamed Arafa



G R E S H A M
S M I T H A N D
P A R T N E R S

January 8, 2010

MEETING NOTES

SR 136 STAKEHOLDERS MEETING WITH CITY OF TALKING ROCK AND PICKENS COUNTY PICKENS COUNTY, GEORGIA GS&P Project No. 26340.09

MEETING DATE: December 14, 2009

PARTICIPANTS: Scott Shelton — Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
Jody Braswell – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
Kent Black – Gresham, Smith and Partners (GS&P)
Jill Brown – Edwards-Pitman (EP)
Bob Howard – Fire Chief, Pickens County
Pete Cagle – Mayor, City of Talking Rock
Robert Jones – Commissioner, Pickens County
Joey Low – Director Planning and Development, Pickens County

DISCUSSION: SR 136 SAFETY PROJECT

1. The City and County stated that over 103 accidents had occurred along SR 136 over the last eight years. The Fire Chief noted that eight of the accidents included fatalities. Also, the County confirmed that SR 136 is one of the most dangerous sections of roadway in the County.
2. The County stated that many of the accidents on SR 136 are related to deer crossing the roadway. However, the County noted this is a county-wide issue.
3. The City and County stated that most of the accidents occurred at the sharp horizontal curve on SR 136 and due to the sharp horizontal curve caused vehicles to overturn.
4. GS&P stated the purpose of the project is to address the safety concerns along SR 136 by making horizontal and vertical improvements to the roadway.
5. GS&P stated that to facilitate public involvement a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) would be formed from stakeholders in the area and would meet 2-3 times

Design Services For The Built Environment

2325 Lakeview Parkway, Suite 400 / Alpharetta, Georgia 30009-7940 / Phone 770.754.0755 / www.gspnet.com

G:\2634009\0_Comm\MM_Meetings\MM Pickens County 12 14 09.doc



MEETING NOTES

SR 136 AND SR 515 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

GS&P Project No. 26340.09

January 8, 2010 December 23, 2009

Page 2

- to gather information and build consensus for an alternative to address safety issues and preserve cultural and historical resources.
6. The City and County requested GS&P recommend GDOT consider a safety project for Antioch and SR 515.
 7. The County stated that Marie Hyde owns the presumed cemetery for Fort Newnan on SR 136, but Ms. Hyde prefers for the cemetery not to be considered significant so that her property might be redeveloped.
 8. GS&P highlighted the history of the project as outlined in the attached agenda. The County recalled receiving phone calls in 2007 about the project because the local residents thought it would widen SR 136.
 9. Chief Howard recommended the Pickens County Administrative Building as a potential location to hold the CAC meetings. The county recommended contacting Debra Watson at 253-8817 regarding the space. To represent the County on the CAC, the County recommended the Fire Chief.
 10. The City and County recommended GS&P coordinate with Sloan Elrod with County Emergency Services for more information about crashes on SR 136.
 11. In regards to coordination with the Masonic Lodge on SR 136, the County recommended contacting the Honorable Rodney Gibson, Probate Judge of Pickens County.
 12. The County stated that flood maps were being updated and preliminary flood maps are available by contacting Joey Low with Pickens County Land Development. The County also recommended Joey Low as a potential CAC member since he owns property along SR 136.
 13. The County mentioned a farmer owned a large piece of land on SR 136 and recommended GS&P coordinate and meet with him about the project.

This represents our understanding of the items discussed at this meeting. If you have any questions or comments concerning any of the information contained herein, please contact me.

Prepared by: Scott Shelton, P.E.
Project Engineer

rjc